

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/723,533	11/26/2003	Anandaroop Bhattacharya	111079-135105	8659	
25943	25943 7590 07/27/2005			EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE			CHERVINSKY	CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PORTLAND,	PORTLAND, OR 97204			, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/723,533	BHATTACHARYA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Boris L. Chervinsky	2835			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloward	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2005. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	\boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/723,533

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozmat in view of Dessiatoun et al. and further in view of Wirtz or alternatively in view of Weber et al.

Ozmat discloses the cooling device for the integrated circuit coupled to substrate including the thermal management device comprising an aluminum case 17 enclosing the porous medium 19, which is bonded to the case 17 (col.3, lines 61-63) and cooling fluid such as water circulating through the case; the porous medium is the metal foam made of copper or aluminum (col. 3, lines 44-49), the thermal interface 13 is coupling the integrated circuit to the case 17. Ozmat discloses the claimed invention except the heat exchanger and the pump. Dessiatoun discloses the thermal management device including the heat exchanger 36 and the pump 38. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the heat exchanger and the pump as disclosed by Dessiatoun in the device disclosed by Ozmat for cooling and circulation of the cooling medium for efficient heat removal.

Ozmat discloses the claimed invention but does not specifically indicate that the porous medium is micro-porous. Wirtz and Weber disclose the thermal management device

Art Unit: 2835

having microporous medium. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use micro-porous medium as disclosed by Wirtz or Weber in the device as disclosed by Ozmat. The method steps of claims 20-25 are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Ozmat in view of Dessatoun and Wirtz.

The details drawn to the size of pores, size of the porous medium and the integrated circuit would have been an obvious matter of design choice, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). The intended use the cooling device for an entertainment unit, disk player or networking interface is obvious since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 10/723,533 Page 4

Art Unit: 2835

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 571-272-2039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BORIS CHÉRVINSKY PRIMARY EXAMINER

hon; h. Conince